12

Georgina Buckler: the making of a British Byzantinist

Charlotte Roueché

Georgina Buckler was one of the very first British scholars to proceed, from a classical background, to the study of a Byzantine author. Her intellectual voyage reflected, to a great extent, her own personal experiences; but it also reflected wider trends, which are of more general interest, which went back to an earlier generation, and which merit discussion in the context of the development of Byzantine studies. Some of her interests, and something of her approach, were foreshadowed in the life of her father, Theodore Walrond.[1]

Theodore Walrond was the second son of a merchant trading between Glasgow and the West Indies. In 1834, at the age of ten, he went to Rugby, where he was a contemporary and friend of Arthur Hugh Clough, the poet, and the headmaster's sons, Matthew and Tom Arnold. Thomas Hughes, the author of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, who almost certainly took Walrond as the model for one of the more heroic characters in that work, wrote in Walrond's obituary that he 'went up the school like a rocket';[2] in October 1840 he became the school's youngest ever head boy. He was still in that position when Doctor Arnold died in June 1842, and stayed on for an extra term 'to carry on the traditions of the school'.[3]

In October 1842 he won a top scholarship to Balliol, where Clough and Matthew and Thomas Arnold were already undergraduates, and the four formed a close friendship. The atmosphere of Oxford was full of new ideas, especially on religious topics. As Hughes wrote:

> There were few rooms in which theology, philosophic and social problems were handled more freely ... But ... he never lost his own firm foothold, or his grasp on the Ten Commandments and the Church Catechism.[4]

This paper was originally written for a colloquium organized by Richard Clogg in March 1988 at King's College London. I am grateful to him for inviting me to speak, and to my parents for helping me to find much of the material used here; I am also grateful to Sir Steven Runciman for some very helpful observations.

[1] See J. Curgenven, 'Theodore Walrond: Friend of Arnold and Clough', *Durham University Journal* 44 (1952), 56–61; Mr Curgenven consulted Georgina Buckler when preparing his article.

[2] *The Spectator* 40 (25 June 1887), 859.

[3] G. G. Bradley, *Guardian* 42.ii (6 July 1887), 1030.

[4] Curgenven, 'Theodore Walrond'.

After obtaining his First Class in Greats in 1846 and in Mathematics in 1847, his first move was back to Rugby, where he taught as an assistant master for three years. In 1851 he returned to Balliol as a Fellow and mathematical tutor, and remained there for five years. During this period he came to know Arthur Stanley who had preceded him at Rugby and Balliol, before becoming a canon of Canterbury in 1851; in the winter of 1852–3 Walrond accompanied Stanley to the Middle East. That journey formed the basis for Stanley's influential work, *Sinai and Palestine,* published in 1856; in the preface the author paid a special tribute to Walrond's contribution:

> Without him the journey, to which I shall always look back as one of the most instructive periods of my life, would in all probability never have been accomplished: on his accurate observation and sound judgement I have constantly relied, both on the spot and since; and though I have touched too slightly on Egypt to avail myself of his knowledge and study of the subject where it would have been most valuable, I feel that his kind supervision of the rest of the volume gives a strong guarantee for the faithful representation of the scenes which we explored together, and of the conclusions to be derived from them.

The purpose of the journey was to visit 'the well-known scenes of sacred history in Egypt, Arabia and Syria'. By the 1850s, many other travellers had already described the places concerned; but Stanley could still claim that while much had been written 'on the History and Geography of the Chosen People, there have been comparatively few attempts to illustrate the relation in which each stands to the other'. His aim was 'on the one hand, to omit no geographical feature which throws any direct light on the History or the Poetry of the Sacred Volume; and, on the other, to insert no descriptions except those which have such a purpose'. There seems to be an implied contrast here with some of the more frivolous or rakish accounts of travels in the East which circulated in the earlier nineteenth century.[5] There is also a specific claim for the value of current learning and modern understanding of the ancient world in assisting the understanding of Scripture, which is completely characteristic of the period. The whole undertaking is full of a sobriety and moderation of purpose, coupled with confident ambition, which seem very Arnoldian.

In this undertaking, the term 'geography' had a wide sense. The first result which Stanley and his companions expected from their geographical study was a better understanding of 'the general character of the nation to which it has furnished a home'. Second, they hoped to ascertain 'how far the forms and expressions of its poetry, its philosophy and its worship have been affected'. Third, they looked for 'explanations of particular events', and only fourth, for 'evidence of the truth of history'.[6] In many ways they were laying down the principles for a modern form of pilgrimage, now that travel to the Holy Lands

[5] Compare, above all, Kinglake's claims for *Eothen*, published in 1844.

[6] *Sinai and Palestine, in Connection with their History* (London, 1856), Preface.

had again become possible. One charm of the trip was their belief that 'the framework of life, of customs, of manners, even of dress and speech, is still substantially the same as it was ages ago'. The resultant work was lucidly and attractively written, and was widely read. On the strength of it, Stanley was chosen to accompany the Prince of Wales to Palestine in 1859, after which he produced a revised edition, which continued to be reissued for the rest of the century, as interest in the geography and history of the Bible grew steadily.

But there was another aspect to this journey. Stanley observed in his preface that the geography of the Holy Land was itself overlaid with the later history of the development of Christianity:

> Greece and Italy have geographical charms of a high order. But they have never provoked a crusade; and, however bitter may have been the disputes of antiquaries about the Acropolis of Athens or the Forum of Rome, they have never, as at Bethlehem and Jerusalem, become matters of religious controversy – grounds for interpreting old prophecies or producing new ones – cases for missions of diplomats or for the war of civilised nations.[7]

The reference here is not just to the crusades, for Jerusalem had recently been an issue of crucial contemporary importance. In the 1830s Baron Bunsen, a German diplomat and a close friend of Dr Thomas Arnold, had proposed that a protestant bishop of Jerusalem be appointed, to preside over both the Lutherans and the Anglicans. The suggestion was furiously opposed by the Catholic wing of the Church of England, and the Jerusalem bishopric was one of the issues which finally decided John Henry Newman to leave that church in 1846.[8]

It is hard not to believe that Stanley had this in mind. But, more broadly, the Oxford Movement had based many of its claims on reference to early church tradition, and had come to re-examine the development of early church doctrine. Another formative influence on Newman was his examination of the Arian heresy and the doctrines of Athanasius.[9] Such an increase of interest in early church history necessarily led to a re-examination of the church which was most obviously the inheritor of the Church of Constantine – the Eastern Orthodox Church. In 1847 and 1850 John Mason Neale had published two volumes of his *History of the Holy Eastern Church*,[10] and a sympathetic study had been published by William Palmer in 1853.[11]

The visit to the Holy Lands had necessarily brought Stanley and his companions into contact with that Church, even if their impressions were not very favourable; the monks of the Monastery of St Catherine on Sinai proved disappointingly unscholarly as guides:

---

[7] *Sinai and Palestine*, Preface, xii–xiii.

[8] See Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua* (Everyman edition), 141–2.

[9] Newman, *Apologia*, 139–40.

[10] The book was written in the perhaps not ideal setting of the English Rooms at Madeira, where Neale had gone for reasons of health.

[11] *Dissertations on the Orthodox, or Eastern Communion* (London, 1853).

> There is probably no branch of the vast fraternity of *ciceroni* so unequal to their task as the twenty-one monks of the most interesting convent in the world. Exiles from the islands in the Greek Archipelago; rebels against monastic rules at home; lunatics sent for recovery; none as a general rule remaining longer than two or three years; with an imperfect knowledge of Arabic, with no call upon their exertions and no check upon their ignorance, they know less about the localities which surround them than the humblest of the Bedouin serfs who wait upon their bounty.[12]

But it is clear that the Orthodox Church made a deeper impression on Stanley than this might suggest. Shortly after the completion of *Sinai and Palestine*, he was appointed Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford in December 1856; and in February 1857, he delivered his inaugural series of lectures on church history. In summer 1857, he set off to visit Russia – the other home of the orthodox tradition – and in the autumn of the same year he delivered his *Lectures on the Eastern Church*.[13] The influence of his travels on the development of this interest is clear. In his initial lecture Stanley put forward reasons why the study of the Eastern Church was important. The primary one was its function as a repository of ancient tradition:

> The churches which have sprung up in those regions retain the ancient customs of the East, and of the primitive age of Christianity, long after they have died out everywhere else. Look for a moment at the countries included within the range of the Oriental Churches. What they lose in historical they gain in geographical grandeur. Their barbarism and their degradation have bound them to the local peculiarities from which the more progressive church of the West has shaken itself free. It is a church, in fact, not of cities and villages, but of mountains and rivers and caves and dens of the earth.[14]

The concept of national character is still very apparent in these lectures:

> The Oriental Church, as a whole, almost from the time that it assumed a distinct existence, has given tokens of that singular immobility which is in great part to be traced to its Eastern origin – its origin in those strange regions which still retain not only the climate and the vegetation, but the manners, the dress, the speech of the days of the Patriarchs and the Pharaohs.[15]

But the Greek Church 'presents to us, in however corrupt and degraded a form, the old, glorious, world-inspiring people of Athens, Thebes and Sparta'; the clergy had a particular role in 'that cause of Greek liberty, in behalf of which in our own country the past generation was so zealous and the present generation is so indifferent'.[16]

---

[12] *Sinai and Palestine*, 31

[13] Published in 1861; republished, with some modifications in the light of visits to Constantinople, Mount Athos, and Alexandria, 1869.

[14] *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (London, 1861); Everyman edition, 57.

[15] *Lectures*, 76.

[16] *Lectures*, 65.

On the whole Stanley was more excited by the Russian Church, which he had visited so recently; but his lectures were widely read, and were influential in attracting attention to the Eastern Church as a whole, and its world. His view of it was perhaps chiefly as a point of reference, a kind of historical document. The closing section of his first lecture was devoted to the usefulness of the study of the Eastern Church to the Church of England:

> If ever ... any changes should be attempted in the English Prayer-Book, many scruples might be soothed by recurring to the model of the Eastern Church. What has never been received into the creeds or the services of churches venerable as those of Oriental Christendom cannot by any sound argument be represented as indispensable to the Church of England.[17]

In this, as in other ways, Stanley both influenced and represented much of the thought of his day.

By the time Stanley returned to Oxford, in 1856, his old friend Walrond had already left. In 1855 he joined the newly created Civil Service Commission, set up to organize the new system of selecting civil servants by public examination. He stayed in what seems to us an unromantic organization, but was then presumably an exciting new undertaking, for the rest of his life, becoming one of the three commissioners in 1875. There was only one moment at which he seemed about to change his career; in 1869 he was a candidate for the headmastership of Rugby, but was passed over, apparently because he was not in Holy Orders. Despite this change of career, Walrond remained in touch with the intellectual circles of his earlier life. In 1859 he married Miss Charlotte Eliot Grenfell. Miss Grenfell, the daughter of Riversdale Grenfell, Esq., was connected with several distinguished scholars. Her sister married Professor Max Müller, the German orientalist who became a Professor at Oxford in 1850, and to whom Stanley had made reference in the preface to the *Lectures on the Eastern Church*; one of her aunts was married to the historian James Anthony Froude, whose brother Hurrell was closely involved with the Tractarians; another aunt, Fanny, was married to Charles Kingsley. It was for his niece Charlotte that Kingsley wrote his poem apostrophizing her to 'Be good, sweet maid, and let who will be clever'. It was Kingsley, too, who produced one of the most successful evocations of the early Byzantine world in his novel *Hypatia*, published in 1853. It was Kingsley's criticisms which provoked Newman into writing his *Apologia* in 1864, of which Walrond published an energetic critique.[18] Walrond also composed the entry on Thomas Arnold for the *Dictionary of National Biography* in 1885, and he was entrusted with the task of writing the biography of Dean Stanley after the latter's death in 1881.[19] His observations on Arnold are perceptive and revealing of the position in which

[17] *Lectures*, 94.

[18] *North British Review* 41 (August 1864).

[19] He was still engaged on this at the time of his death.

those trying to strike a 'middle way' could find themselves in the heat of the conflicts in Victorian England: 'Many who admired his freedom of thought could not understand his firm adherence to the old faith; many who shared his reverent spirit were shocked by his liberal opinions.'

Charlotte Walrond had three sons and three daughters, before her death of a miscarriage in 1872, when she was 31, and the youngest of those children, Georgina, born in 1868, was three. In 1876, when Georgina was seven, Theodore Walrond remarried; his second wife was Henrietta Louisa Grenfell, the second cousin of his first wife, who was then aged 50. Georgina gives a telling description of her: 'Whatever Mama thought her duty she did unflinchingly, even when it involved (as she thought) telling painful truths to others.' These truths included 'warning me that I must never expect to get on as well in Society as my two elder sisters, because I was "so much less attractive".'[20] But Georgina does write of her with real affection and respect.

The Walronds were not particularly well-off – a civil servant's pay was not over-generous, and the Walrond private fortune, based on sugar plantations in the West Indies, had been decreasing steadily in value; there was only enough money to send two of the three boys to university. The three girls were given a sound education at home by a governess; Georgina's lessons started the day after her third birthday, and she could read when she was four; later she learnt some elementary Latin as well as French and German. Her diaries reveal a sober way of life, where it was normal to attend three church services – each with a sermon – every Sunday; the family did not do much formal entertaining, but had a large circle of friends and cousins, most of them far better off than the Walronds. Her stepmother, while clearly duly affectionate, had made it clear to Georgina that, not being a beauty, she would do best to develop her intellect. The opportunity to do this arose when, in the early 1880s, the Walronds moved from Taplow, near Maidenhead, to live in London, at Lancaster Gate. In 1872 The Girls' Public Day School Trust had been established with the motto 'Knowledge is now no more a Fountain Sealed' to provide a high standard of education for girls without requiring them to go away from home. One of the principal founders, Lady Stanley of Alderley, was a cousin of Georgina's aunt, Mrs Henry Grenfell, and Mrs Grenfell became a member of the council of the trust. Lancaster Gate was only a short walk from the second school opened by the trust in 1873, Notting Hill High School, and it seems likely that Mrs Grenfell encouraged Mrs Walrond to send her clever but plain stepdaughter to the school.[21]

On 20 January 1885 Georgina, aged 16, started at the high school. It was still a relatively unusual step for a girl of her background; in her diary for the first

[20] *Reminiscences* (unpublished), 14.

[21] It is entirely indicative of the scale of priorities that Mrs Grenfell never sent her own daughter, of exactly the same age, to school; her parents needed her at home, and did not want to be kept in London for too many months of the year.

day she records: 'The girls as a set are not attractive. I should think several were tradesmen's daughters'. But she travelled to school every day with the local vicar's daughter.[22] She soon found other congenial spirits – among whom was Miss Hilda Stevenson, daughter of an MP, the future mother of another Byzantinist – Sir Steven Runciman. School almost immediately started to provide stimulation and delight. On 6 February of the same year she wrote in her diary 'I am to learn Greek during the scripture hour – joy, joy !'.[23] The Greek, which she found 'decidedly tough',[24] was taught by a Miss MacLeod, to whom she was soon passionately devoted. She immediately began to achieve excellent marks in all subjects. But the freedom which school offered was to a certain extent limited by a firm regime at home. In the autumn she had come second in an essay competition for all the girls at trust schools; but when the school wanted to print her essay in the school magazine, her father refused permission; he 'disliked the publicity of it'.[25] In March she learned that she had obtained a First Class in the Cambridge senior local examinations.[26] On the strength of that she received an offer from Newnham College of a scholarship of £35 for three years;[27] this was followed by two offers from Girton, of scholarships of £42 and £35. All of these she had to refuse;[28] the reason was presumably both her age (she was still only seventeen) but probably also the family finances. In a letter later in life she wrote that, when she decided she did want to go to Cambridge – presumably as a result of these offers – her father 'thought it a mistake and a pity', but would not stand in her way. While it cannot be detected through the respectful pages of her diary, there must have been some tension between the influences of her family and of the school. In the April 1886 school exams she again shone, and was described to a visitor by the headmistress as 'going to be "one of the leading women of the future"'.[29]

In her diary she also kept a record of public events, occasionally with a personal connection. During 1885–6 the widowed Queen was at last starting to reappear in public; in May 1886 she opened the Colonial Exhibition at the Albert Hall, where, as part of the festivities, ' "God Save the Queen" was sung by the Albert Hall Choir in Sanscrit, translated by Uncle Max' (Professor Max Müller).[30] She

[22] Miss Una Ridgeway, who was in due course to marry a young man called Ronald Burrows – the future Principal of King's College, without whom the Koraes Chair might never have been established; see R. Clogg, *Politics and the Academy* (London, 1986).

[23] By the end of her first term she got the top examination marks in her form: 'Miss Jones (the headmistress) was so pleased with me that she kissed me'. Diary, 1 April 1885.

[24] Diary entry.

[25] Diary entry, 19 February 1886.

[26] As had also her cousin Maud Grenfell, still being taught at home. She was second girl in all England; in English, Scripture and German she was first of both boys and girls. (Diary entries, 3 March, 13 March and 29 March 1886.)

[27] Diary entry, 11 March 1886.

[28] Diary entry, 29 March 1886.

[29] Diary entry, 16 April 1886; her lowest mark was 81 per cent.

[30] Diary entry, 4 May 1886.

had her first Greek lesson with Papa ('so nice') during the holidays.[31] In November 1886 she was taken by Miss MacLeod to a course of four lectures at the South Kensington Museum by Jane Harrison, on 'Attic Myths as Represented on Greek Pottery'; she made an exquisite illustrated précis of their contents.

During 1886–7 Georgina was working for the next major national examination, the Cambridge higher local, which she was to take in mid-June 1887. At the end of May that year Theodore Walrond, now aged 63, felt unwell, and went to the doctor; he went away for a long weekend in the country, but returned no better. On 4 June he took to his bed, and, when Georgina came back from tea with friends she found 'lots of hats in the hall': the doctors were upstairs, operating on her father.[32] She started her examinations on 13 June, and was due to take another paper two days later; but that day her father's condition suddenly worsened. The preparations for the Queen's Jubilee were going on, and, as Theodore became more confused, he urged his family to go and watch, and not mind him. He died early on the morning of 16 June 1887. He was much mourned, and a group of his friends subsequently commissioned a memorial for Balliol Chapel, composed in Latin by Jowett.

In the autumn of that year Georgina worked for the rest of the Higher Local examinations – even in the grim circumstances of the summer examinations she had obtained a distinction in the Greek paper which she had taken. She was also working for an essay prize, offered to girls in schools of the Girls' Public Day School Trust by Lady Stanley of Alderley – the subject was a comparison of the style of Macaulay and Carlyle. In November she learned that she had got the first prize: 'I went to tea with Lady Stanley on the strength of it: she was alarming, but very kind. She was quite rabid about my *duty* in going to Girton.'[33] In December she retook the higher local examinations, Group B, and obtained a First, with distinctions in Greek, Latin and French.[34] In June she took the Girton scholarship examination,[35] and came out first, winning a scholarship of 80 guineas a year, which must have been a considerable help to her widowed stepmother. At the end of July she left Notting Hill High School;[36] and on 12 October 1888 Georgina Walrond went up to Girton to read Classics.

For her days at Cambridge we have both letters and two fascinating diaries. The resultant impression of the life of a woman undergraduate in the 1880s is very different from what one might expect. Her particular good fortune was

[31] In July 1886, for the first time, she took a school examination in Greek, and came first, with 83 per cent (Diary entries, 24 July 1886 and 17 August 1886).

[32] Diary entry.

[33] Diary, November 1887.

[34] Diary, January 16 1888.

[35] At Burlington House. Diary, 11–14 June 1888.

[36] 'Top in all I took, except Euclid. Lowest marks 90' (Diary, 27 July 1888).

that she came up with several introductions to families in Cambridge; and it is clear that, as long as a young lady could find a chaperone from among the married ladies of Cambridge, she could have an extremely active social life, with endless dinner parties, and even private dances. In a later memoir she described how Cambridge revealed to her a wider world of people from different backgrounds, and even foreigners: 'I had grown up to think that everyone who did not think and speak like my own brothers and sisters was peculiar, and must if possible be shunned.'[37] In her letters it is clear that she did not approve at first of the style of some of the people she met; in a letter of 1888 she commented unfavourably on the untidiness of Miss Fawcett, but in 1890 she was in the crowd which went to cheer at the announcement that Miss Fawcett had been placed higher than the Senior Wrangler.

Despite all her social activity, however, she worked extremely hard throughout her Cambridge career. In a letter to her cousin she describes her Girton day. She would get up at 5.45 and work; if she fell asleep, the maid was instructed to wake her again at 7.00. At 8.00 she would attend prayers, followed by breakfast at 8.15, and a day of study. 'It is really too delicious reading all the books I have longed to for years, the Hippolytus, Prometheus, etc', she wrote in 1888, when she was already being warned not to read too much.[38] Later she commented that she was enjoying Plautus, Homer, 'and some Catullus, which is quite delightful. I recommend him to your notice. Of course, there is any amount that it is simply too coarse and improper for words in all these worthies. It is the great drawback of Classics, I think.'[39]

In 1890 her letters to her cousin began to include references to someone called 'the HB' or 'the Heaven-Born'. It was a good description of WHB, William Hepburn Buckler, who did have a slightly unreal quality. He had been born a year before her, in 1867, in Paris, but he was an American citizen. His father was a doctor from Baltimore, Maryland, who had married a strong-minded widow with two sons, Eliza White. After the end of the war between the States, Mrs Buckler decided that the Southern States were no longer fit for gentlemanly life, and the family had moved to Paris. They lived in a community of Americans from the South, and saw very little society. William was educated at home; his mother began his education, teaching him to read at four, and starting him on Latin at five. When he was six he began to be taught by a French governess, and he was effectively bilingual for the rest of his life, as well as acquiring German and Italian while he was a child; his mother also taught herself Greek in order to be able to read the New Testament with him in that language. He continued to be educated privately until, in 1887, he was allowed to go to Trinity College, Cambridge.

---

[37] *The Girton Review*, 1928.

[38] Letter, 1888.

[39] Letter, March 1889.

At Cambridge he found himself among his own contemporaries almost for the first time. This was a challenge, as was the task of getting to grips with a new educational system devised to meet the requirements of the products of England's public schools. He found very little help or guidance from his tutor, and felt afterwards that while working diligently, he had in fact been allowed to waste much of his time. For the first three years he read history, but only obtained a Third in 1890; in the following year he studied law, and obtained a Class II with distinction in 1891. He had a classical education behind him, and appeared in the Cambridge Greek play in 1890, as Athene in the *Ion*. He also had a busy social life, both in Cambridge and in London, where his much older half-brother was Chargé d'Affaires at the United States Embassy. But on 25 May 1889 he met Georgina Walrond, and by 1890 her letters were already full of him. That winter she met his formidable mother for the first time, and in March 1891 they became engaged. Despite all these excitements, in 1891 she was the only woman to obtain a First Class in the Classical Tripos, Part I, Division 3. Mrs Buckler immediately carried her son off on a long visit to the United States, perhaps to test his resolve, but in May 1892 Georgina and William Buckler were married.

It was a step into an entirely new world for Georgina. The Walronds had not been well off since Theodore's death. She was now married to a rich man, who took her off to his family property in Baltimore, Maryland. There he became a member of the Bar, and practised for ten years in a local law firm, as well as studying in the Law School at the University of Maryland and publishing articles; his two chief interests were trade unionism, and Roman law. It is less easy to trace Georgina's activities. She was busy being a very active hostess and fulfilling the other duties of the wife of a prominent citizen; she was involved in starting a women's club, and assembling money for a range of good causes. She also worked on lectures for various groups, and for a Cambridge University essay prize. But she had other preoccupations. In 1893 her first child, Lucy, was born. The birth was a difficult one; and the next sixteen years were punctuated by a series of pregnancies which ended badly – in a note of her life she records four premature babies, who died, as well as several miscarriages, each followed by a longer convalescence than the last, until the eventual birth of Barbara in February 1909, when Georgina was 40. This must have thrown a very dark shadow over these years, and is something from which she never entirely recovered.

By 1903 both the Bucklers were feeling restless; William gave up his job with the Baltimore law firm, and, with his wife and daughter, went to spend the winter in Rome,[40] followed by a visit to Greece. For both of them, it was their first contact with the visible remains of the civilizations which they had studied, and it made a very deep impression on them. The influence of this

[40] His brother was at the embassy there.

experience was not felt immediately. In the following years William continued to write on legal subjects, and to perform his public functions in Baltimore; in 1904 he became Secretary to the Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University. Georgina also turned her mind towards the university, and started work for a PhD in Hebrew at Johns Hopkins. Then in 1906 a new opening arose, when William accepted the position of Secretary to the Special United States Envoy who was sent to Spain to attend the marriage of the king, Alfonso XIII. He and his family spent the rest of that year travelling in Europe, and when they returned to Baltimore, William, half seriously, took the Diplomatic Service examination, and achieved 95 per cent. As a consequence, he accepted a post at the American Embassy in Madrid in 1907.

But, in the very same year, before taking up that post, he travelled with two other American scholars, Howard Butler of Princeton, and David Robinson of Johns Hopkins, to Constantinople, to look into the possibilities for excavating at the site of Sardis, in ancient Lydia. Between 1907 and 1909 the Bucklers were living in Madrid – from where Georgina travelled in autumn 1908 to England for the successful birth of their second and last surviving child early in 1909. But William had continued to consider the Sardis project, and to become more and more actively involved. In 1909, when his tour of duty in Madrid came to an end, he left the Foreign Service; and in May 1910 he set off to join the excavations at Sardis. In his first year on the site his duties were largely administrative; but in 1911 the excavators found a large inscription in the temple, which he recognized as a mortgage, and was able to interpret from his study of Roman law. From that moment he took over responsibility for the inscriptions uncovered by the excavation.[41]

During this period Georgina did not accompany him to Turkey, but remained with her precious new daughter, living chiefly in Bournemouth, where the climate was considered best for the baby. It seems clear, however, that she was closely involved with the development of this new interest, that was so much a continuation of the tradition in which she had been brought up.

The American expedition worked at Sardis every spring from 1910 to 1914. In August that year the Bucklers were on holiday in France, when war broke out. As soon as they were safely back in England, William returned to his native Paris, and joined the American Ambulance Corps. Georgina followed him, and together they set up a branch of the Red Cross Inquiry for the Wounded and Missing, initially at Boulogne. But by the end of that year they had returned to London, where he had been called into service by the United States Embassy, to act in charge of Turkish, and later Austrian, interests. From 1916 he had the special responsibility of investigating the attitude of Liberal and Labour Parties in Britain to the establishment of peace.

Meanwhile, Georgina was extremely busy. She had continued her Red Cross inquiry work in London, helping to meet the ever growing demand for

[41] His first publication of inscriptions from Sardis, with D. M. Robinson, appeared in 1913.

information about the wounded and missing. An unexpected insight into her work is provided by Christopher Isherwood's study of his parents, *Kathleen and Frank*.[42] Frank Isherwood disappeared in action near Ypres on 7 or 8 May 1915. In her diary for 17 May the desperate Mrs Isherwood mentions having found another Red Cross inquiry bureau, in Arlington Street, and on 1 June she is making 'a visit again to Mrs Buckler'. A week later 'Mrs Buckler promised to get her husband to enquire of the American Ambassador in Berlin, making a personal matter of it.' By mid-June Mrs Buckler had obtained three different reports of the events, on whose reliability she commented carefully; on 24 June they received confirmation of Frank Isherwood's death. On 28 June Katherine Isherwood recorded: 'Mrs Buckler too wrote so kindly: "It makes my heart ache in a way you may think absurd, even intrusive in a stranger"'. Georgina's work with the inquiry department continued until 1920, and she was awarded the CBE in 1918.

But these practical responsibilities did not exhaust her energies; the same period saw her first return to academic activity. In 1916 she was awarded the Gibson Prize of the University of Cambridge for an essay entitled *National Sentiment and Patriotism in the New Testament*.[43] It was a topical and contentious subject, and the essay opened quite aggressively:

> Probably never since the world began have National Sentiment and Patriotism loomed so large on the mental horizon as at present, when no less than fourteen nations are at war. And probably never has there been a less unqualified acceptance of them, as adequate springs of action... It ought surely therefore to be helpful as well as interesting to go back to the sources of the Christian religion which twelve out of the fourteen belligerent nations profess, and see what the New Testament preaches as to National Sentiment and Patriotism.

There follows a scholarly analysis, first of contemporary attitudes to patriotism among Jews and Gentiles,[44] and then of the attitudes of Christ[45] and the Apostles.[46] According to her analysis, the Jews had developed an increasing strain of nationalistic intolerance, in contrast with the relaxed attitudes of Greeks and Romans; but this nationalism was specifically rejected by Christ.

> Whether Patriotism is itself good or bad, its advocates are bound to admit that it is never expressly inculcated by Christ; nay more, as far as its contemporary form went, is constantly discouraged.[47]

Her conclusion is that

> In as far as [the New Testament's] writers and actors are Christian, so far are they international rather than national, cosmopolitan rather than patriotic... To the

[42] London, 1971, 330–5.

[43] Published by Deighton Bell & Co., Cambridge, in 1917.

[44] *National Sentiment*, 3–20.

[45] *National Sentiment*, 20–30.

[46] *National Sentiment*, 30–42.

[47] *National Sentiment*, 22.

> ordinary reader of the New Testament one fact surely must be perfectly clear – that patriotism is not in itself a Christian virtue.We are to love all men and obey our rulers, but to distinctive national sentiment there is no appeal. On the contrary, the aim of Christ and His followers would seem to have been the abolishing of national differences, the dissipation of racial prejudices and antagonisms, the breaking down of those middle walls of partition which we, with our flags and our national anthems and our customs-duties and our so-called patriotism have toiled so successfully to rebuild.[48]

In writing this essay Georgina drew on many other writers, but she was prepared to disagree on this issue specifically with authorities as weighty as William Temple, Westcott and James Martineau.[49] After over twenty years of living in countries other than her own she was perhaps particularly sympathetic to the 'cosmopolitan' attitude which she detected in the Apostles; but after two years of war it must have taken some courage to express such sentiments. The work, it seems to me, is entirely typical of her background and tradition. Here again we see the serious-minded application of scholarship to Christian texts, in the confident belief that this can be of benefit to modern Christians; it is the same spirit in which her father had explored the lands of the Bible, 60 years earlier. It also echoes the liberal Christianity of Thomas Arnold, as well as the world-view of those Wilsonian circles in the American Administration with which her husband was associated.

Although the Bucklers were, at least at first, the citizens of a neutral country, they were profoundly involved in the war and deeply aware of the tragedies which it was producing. William became increasingly involved with Woodrow Wilson's attempts to bring about a peace. After the war, he assisted the American delegation at Versailles, and as a result of his familiarity with left-wing parties, was even sent on a secret mission to try to establish contact with the new Russian regime, meeting Litvinoff in Sweden. In December 1919 the United States delegation left Paris, having failed either to sign the Treaty of Versailles or to join the League of Nations; and William Buckler resigned from the American Foreign Service. He was very disappointed by this outcome, and from then on found more sympathetic views in Europe; in 1922 the Bucklers moved to Oxford, which was to be their home for the remaining 30 years of their lives. William now returned to his archaeological interests; but he continued to take an interest in international affairs, and to remain true to the Wilsonian ideals of liberal internationalism which had been so rudely rebuffed in the United States. On visits to Baltimore in the 1920s he was involved in encouraging American support for a new non-partisan movement in support of the League of Nations; in 1923 both the Bucklers lectured in Baltimore on this issue.

There was more fellow-feeling perhaps to be found in Oxford, where Gilbert Murray, Regius Professor of Greek, had become Chairman of the League of

[48] *National Sentiment*, 43.
[49] *National Sentiment*, 42.

Nations Union and a delegate to Geneva, where he served on the Committee for Intellectual Cooperation. Gilbert Murray's activities provoked a letter from the vice-chancellor questioning whether these activities were compatible with his continuing to hold the Chair of Greek;[50] but Murray saw no inconsistency between his academic and his internationalist work: 'There has never been a day, I suppose, when I have failed to give thought both to the work for peace and for Hellenism.'[51] The attitude of mind recalls that strong sense of the unity of things ascribed to Thomas Arnold by Theodore Walrond: 'Every art was of importance, as affecting the great struggle everywhere and at all times going on between good and evil.'[52] This was the tradition which nourished both the Bucklers; and Murray's Oxford was precisely the right place for each of them to develop their wide range of interests. In the 1920s, William became increasingly involved with the development of a project of international scholarship. Largely at his instigation, 'The American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor' was set up in 1922, and sponsored a series of survey trips by scholars of several nationalities, with the laudable aim of 'recording the monuments above ground before seeking those that lie safe below the surface'; the results of those surveys were published as *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*.[53] He became an associate of All Souls and of Balliol and, in 1937, of the British Academy.

His work in Asia Minor had soon brought him into touch with the greatest living British authority on Asia Minor, Sir William Ramsay. William Mitchell Ramsay had been born in 1851, and had studied classics at Aberdeen and at Oxford. Since 1881 he had been travelling regularly in Asia Minor; since 1911 he had been Regius Professor of Humanity at Aberdeen. His work is the foundation of a great deal of our present understanding of the classical geography of Asia Minor. He was also well known outside academic circles, for reasons which now make much of his writing seem very dated. Ramsay was continuing the tradition set by Stanley, in *Sinai and Palestine*, in that he was particularly interested in the historical geography of the Bible – in his case, that of the New Testament, and particularly the Acts of the Apostles. Like Stanley, he believed in the application of current historical method to the evidence of the Bible. His approach to historical geography also echoes that of Stanley; thus an article of his opens:

> If geography be regarded as the study of the influence which the physical features and situation of a country exert on the people who live in it, then in no country can geography be studied better than in Asia Minor.[54]

---

[50] See the memoir of him by Arnold Toynbee, 'The Unity of Gilbert Murray's Life and Work', in *Gilbert Murray: An Unfinished Autobiography, with Contributions by his Friends* (London 1960), 212–20.

[51] From a broadcast in 1956, quoted by Toynbee, *Gilbert Murray*, 212.

[52] 'Thomas Arnold', *DNB*.

[53] The ninth volume of this series, based on work done in 1925–6 in northern Phrygia by Christopher Cox and others and prepared by Barbara Levick and Stephen Mitchell, was published as *Journal of Roman Studies* Monograph 4 in 1988, and the tenth will be published in 1993.

[54] 'Asia Minor: The Country and its Religion', *Luke the Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion* (London, 1908), 105.

He was inclined to invoke the *genius loci* to explain religious developments precisely as Stanley had done – pointing out, for example, the relationship of the successive cults of Artemis and of the Virgin Mary at Ephesus.[55]

It was for his work relating to the New Testament that Ramsay was widely known to a lay public; but he also worked steadily and carefully to record a wide range of material during his many years of travel in Asia Minor.[56] He worked on the later history of the Christian Church in Asia Minor; and all his work on topography confronted him with the physical remains of Byzantine civilization, and also required the constant use of Byzantine sources. Like Stanley, he became increasingly acquainted with the Orthodox Church; he comments interestingly on the fact that when he first started to travel in Asia Minor (in the late 1870s) there were many orthodox communities which did not speak or understand Greek, but that by the early 1900s these had all become Greek-speaking:

> That old Roman Empire is not dead, but sleeping. It will die only when Hellenism ceases in the Aegean lands, and when the church is no longer a living force among their population. We see then what a power among men this Orthodox Church has been and still is... The historian must regard with interest this marvellous phenomenon, and he must try to understand it as it appears in the centuries.[57]

His observations on the Orthodox Church in Byzantine times are delivered with the same vigour as were Stanley's. In a study of the town of Barata, in Lycaonia, he wrote of the period of revival, between 850 and 1070: 'The late churches produce the general impression of a degenerating people, a dying civilisation, an epoch of ignorance, and an Empire going to ruin.' On the period after the battle of Manzikert in 1071, he was even more severe:

> The people were dominated by ecclesiastical interests... Patriotism could not survive in such an atmosphere; and there is no reason to think that the Imperial government either tried or deserved to rouse a national and loyal spirit, for it was becoming steadily more oriental, more despotic and more rigid. But the major part of the blame for the national decay must be laid on the Orthodox Church. The nation had been delivered over to its care. It had long been supreme and its authority unquestioned. The result was that art and learning and education were dead, and the monasteries were left. The Orthodox Church had allied itself with autocracy against the people, and with the superstitious mob against the heretics and the thinkers. Its triumph meant the ruin of the nation and the degradation of higher morality and intellect and Christianity and art. In our excavations, never deep, we never found any article worth picking up off the ground.[58]

Those words are from a lecture delivered in 1908 at the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Berlin. But his interest in this area of study continued,

[55] *Luke the Physician*, 133ff.

[56] *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* was published in 1890.

[57] 'The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire', *Luke the Physician*, 148–9.

[58] *Luke the Physician*, 162–3.

and deepened, and in 1924 Ramsay attended, and spoke at, the first International Congress of Byzantine Studies, held in Bucharest. He was appointed by that congress to a committee to supervise the foundation of an international journal of Byzantine studies, and in the same year the first volume of *Byzantion* was published.[59]

William Buckler's new project to record inscriptions was entirely in accordance with Ramsay's own undertakings, and Sir William became a friend of both the Bucklers. William Buckler's experience had been similar: he published several Byzantine inscriptions either found in his travels, or seen in the hands of dealers.[60] For several years Georgina had been thinking of resuming her own academic activities – doubtless encouraged by her success with the Gibson Prize essay. William Ramsay was instrumental both in encouraging her to do so, and in her choice of subject, and in 1920 she started working on a translation of Anna Comnena. On 1 December 1923 the Bucklers were among the organizers of a party for William Ramsay, held at Christ Church Oxford, to celebrate both his seventieth birthday, and the volume written in his honour, *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* – a volume many of whose articles are still authoritative. Among the guests, significantly, was Professor Henri Grégoire, the Belgian Byzantinist, who had inherited from Cumont the task of preparing a corpus of the *Christian Inscriptions of Asia Minor*; the first (and, as it turned out, the only) fascicule of that corpus had been published in 1922, and had demonstrated how the recognition of Byzantine inscriptions as such, and their interpretation on their own terms, could turn texts which had made no sense to their earlier copyists into lucid historical documents.[61] Grégoire was also the editor of *Byzantion*.

Less than a week later, on 5 December 1923, Georgina Buckler received a letter confirming that she could be admitted to St Hugh's College to study for a BLitt. She was just 55. In January 1924 she took her Cambridge BA and MA (since degrees had not been awarded to women at the time of her original graduation) and was formally admitted to St Hugh's College; the subject of her BLitt (later converted to a DPhil) was to be 'The Intellectual and Moral Standards of Anna Comnena'. Her supervisor was R.M. Dawkins; she described a visit from him:

> He was full of admiration for my industry, and thought the parts I read him 'very interesting', but he wasn't particularly helpful, as he became absorbed in the folder on Style which I haven't written up yet, and hardly meant to.[62]

---

[59] See *Byz* 1 (1924) vi and 736; cf. also the memoir of Ramsay by H. Grégoire, *Byz* 6 (1937), v–xii.

[60] 'The Monument of a Palaiologina', *Mélanges Schlumberger* (Paris, 1924), 521–6; 'Deux inscriptions de Constantinople', *Byz* 3 (1927); 'A memento of Stauropolis', *BZ* 28 (1928), 98–101; 'Un discours de consulaire sous Justinien', *Byz* 6 (1931), 365–70.

[61] H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1922).

[62] Letter to WHB, 1928.

Dinner in honour of Sir William Ramsay, Senior Combination Room, Christ Church, Oxford, 1 December 1923.

From left to right: *Back row*; W.H. Buckler, Miss Ramsay, Professor William Calder, Mrs Robinson, Mrs Gall (sister to Mr Anderson); *To left of table*; Professor Fraser, Mr J.G.C. Anderson, Lady Ramsay, Mr H.R. Hall, Mrs Hogarth, Mr E.S.G. Robinson; *To right of table*; Georgina Buckler, Professor Henri Grégoire, Mr Hogarth, Sir William Ramsay.

It is not clear that he was the best supervisor for a thesis with this particular focus; but it is also questionable how easy he would have found it to direct his pupil.

Against the background that has been described, it is perhaps easier to understand the book which resulted; for the thesis, completed in 1927, was published in 1929 by Oxford University Press.[63] First and foremost, of course, comes the choice of Anna herself – a natural choice of subject for one nurtured in the traditions of women's education. Shortly before Georgina's thesis was published attention had been drawn to Anna by Naomi Mitchison, who included a portrayal of her in a series entitled 'Representative Women.'[64] A translation of the *Alexiad* was in hand, by another woman scholar, Dr Elizabeth Dawes, and was published in 1928. Georgina also revealed her interest in the status of Byzantine women in a later article on the subject.[65] Anna must have been particularly attractive as a woman who asserted herself in precisely the way available to women of Georgina's generation – by scholarship.

But the background also explains aspects of the book which present us with greater difficulties. It stands out as being a serious study of a Byzantine author – not patronizing that author for being the victim of time and place, but engaging directly with the text. It can be argued that it is the lack of directly engaged studies of this kind which has helped to make Byzantine literature so particularly inaccessible. And yet, in reading the book the modern reader is likely to be startled by the questions which Georgina chose to ask. It is essential to bear in mind the title of the thesis from which it was developed. Georgina was specifically concerned with 'the intellectual and moral standards' of the author. In a way that separates her immediately from those of us who write only a few decades later, she wrote within a firmly defined moral framework which makes the assessment of 'intellectual and moral standards' a straightforward matter.

The opening section gives a factual framework, and the second half of the book is arranged under headings which still seem standard: 'Anna and Education', 'Anna as Historian', 'Anna as Writer' (Sections IV–VI). But she devotes an interesting second section to 'Anna as a Personality.'[66] After discussing various historical points, she devotes a subsection to 'Her Selfpity.'[67] In doing so she perceptively isolates an aspect of Anna's writing which grates on a modern reader; but she does not look either for explanations in terms of modern psychology or, as perhaps one might expect, in terms of literary precedent. Part of the analysis which she offers is entirely in the old tradition of determining national character: 'First there is the factor of self-pity founded

[63] *Anna Comnena: A Study* (Oxford, 1929).

[64] *Anna Comnena* (London, 1928).

[65] 'Women in Byzantine Law about 1100 A. D.', *Byz* 11 (1936), 391–416.

[66] *Anna Comnena*, 27–61.

[67] *Anna Comnena*, 35–46.

on that vanity which has always figured in the Greek character and is indeed not unknown in other nations.'[68] This old tradition of writing, which has already been exemplified above, was not yet dead; when William Miller reviewed *Anna Comnena* he too was on the look-out for reflections of national character:

> It is not in language alone that [Anna's] history sometimes reads like a scene from recent Greek life. Thus the reviewer met in 1914 during the insurrection in Northern Epeiros a Greek bishop with prayer-book in his pocket and rifle in his hand, who recalled the fighting prelates of the crusades, and King Constantine's personal care for his soldiers resembled that of Alexios.[69]

A particularly remarkable point about that observation is that Miller has precisely missed the point that Georgina was making when she pointed out that the Byzantine clergy did *not* fight, in striking contrast with the crusader priests.[70]

But the overall tone of the discussion is of someone trying to find out what another individual was like, as a person; it is constantly set out in terms of the reactions of the author and her readers, and their moral judgements:

> We can sympathize with her over the loss of parents and husband, but not with the exaggerated frenzy into which it throws her; we can pity her for her life in enforced retirement, but when between the lines we read her implacable hatred, we feel that in John's place we should have insisted on the same.[71]

Similar references to the probable response of modern readers are scattered throughout the book :

> If we laugh at Anna for conceit and pretentiousness is it not fair to ask ourselves: 'Where except in the famous house of Valois can we find her like?'[72]

The particular direction of Georgina's study is most strikingly reflected in the organization of the third section. After 'Anna as a Personality', we have 'Anna as a Character',[73] although the significance of the distinction is not spelled out. The most astonishing thing about this section, and one which makes it very difficult to use, is that it is subdivided under 'The Three Theological Virtues' – Faith, Hope and Charity –and 'The Four Cardinal Virtues' – Temperance, Fortitude, Wisdom and Justice. Even contemporary reviewers were somewhat startled at this arrangement: 'This rather fantastic device fails equally to explain the mediaeval, and to enlighten the modern, mind.'[74] But it illustrates

---

[68] *Anna Comnena*, 35.
[69] *English Historical Review* (June 1930), 295.
[70] *Anna Comnena*, 100ff.
[71] *Anna Comnena*, 45.
[72] *Anna Comnena*, 51.
[73] *Anna Comnena*, 65–162.
[74] Z.N. Brooke, *The Classical Review* (1930), 44–5, 45.

fascinatingly the extent to which Georgina perceived Anna and herself as belonging essentially to one and the same Christian tradition – as also, again, did her readers; in her presentation of those points on which Anna's standards seem different, the most striking feature is the assumption that measurement is possible:

> When we turn to the four Cardinal Virtues ordinarily so called we are at once struck with important differences between Anna's standard and ours. Our views on Temperance may be identical with hers, but her Wisdom seems to us mostly Cunning, and of Justice in the broader sense she knows nothing; while her profound conviction that Discretion is the better part of Valour makes her Fortitude appear to us a sadly emasculated thing.[75]

It seems to me clear that Georgina presented these matters in this way because, in fact, that was what she considered important. With all the 'high seriousness' of her nineteenth-century background, she considered that even after eight centuries an author could and should be assessed on her moral standards. It is an approach from which we are almost completely cut off – if only because we do not, in most areas, accept a shared standard for such judgements. As a consequence, we ask different kinds of questions of our historical sources. But her approach, supported as it was by careful and informed reading of the *Alexiad* itself, and of contemporary literature, does produce some helpful insights; and her summary of 'Anna as a Personality' is worth pondering:

> Anna Comnena spent her youth and middle age in the most sumptuous court in Christendom, where men were striving to maintain classical ideals in the face of barbarians on the East and barbarians on the West. Born in the purple, she associated with her immediate family and the 'kinsmen', and probably with no one else except an occasional learned man. The wonder is, not that she set so much store by outward advantages, but that she does not set more, indeed that she is not more proud, more conceited, more narrow, more arrogant, than we actually find her to be.[76]

That observation is not unhelpful to a serious reader who wants to tackle the *Alexiad*.

When *Anna Comnena* was published Georgina was already 60. The book received a wildly enthusiastic review from Grégoire, punctuated with characteristic observations: it was the fact that she was a woman which gave her such a particular insight into Anna's character, while the meticulous and scholarly method he attributed to the influence of her husband![77] Dölger wrote a far more sober review in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, commenting on the energy of the book, but observing that its great length was in part due to a basic unfamil-

---

[75] *Anna Comnena*, 130.
[76] *Anna Comnena*, 61.
[77] *Byz* 4 (1929), 684–92.

iarity with Byzantine civilization before or after Anna, which led her to comment on what did not require comment.[78]

Georgina wrote several articles and reviews, particularly for the new periodical *Byzantion*;[79] and she and William continued to be actively involved in Byzantine undertakings. Volume XII of *Byzantion* was dedicated to them in 1937, very probably because they had given financial assistance. In 1931 the two Bucklers, their son-in-law (a practising architect) and Harold Buxton, the Bishop of Gibraltar, went on an expedition to investigate the Byzantine antiquities of Cyprus, and in 1933 they published the first account in English of the important twelfth-century church at Asinou.[80] Meanwhile Georgina was looking for a new research topic. She first thought of writing something on the Byzantines' knowledge of the Bible, something which she would have done very well.[81] But her consideration of Anna's ideas, and their possible sources, had led her to use the so-called *Strategikon* of Kekaumenos, written in the third quarter of the eleventh century, and first published in 1896; she now decided to edit the work. She reported with some glee the observation of a foreign colleague, to whom she announced this intention: 'Kekaumène ? C'est dur; ce n'est pas un travail de femme.' She published a couple of articles on Kekaumenos before and during the war,[82] and completed an edition and commentary. Her handicap now was not that she was a woman, but that she was growing old. *Anna Comnena* is a work of astonishing energy. But when, with the help of Professor Joan Hussey, I finally got hold of Georgina's *Kekaumenos*, it was a far less exciting work. She and William spent the Second World War in the USA, as did their old friend Grégoire; volumes XV to XVII of *Byzantion* were published there. When they returned to Europe after the war, she sent *Kekaumenos* to Grégoire to publish. It even reached first proofs, and was announced as imminent in 1952; but in March 1952 William Buckler died, and Georgina died a year later, in April 1953. Thereafter no more work seems to have been done on the publication of her Kekaumenos. This may reflect Grégoire's own age; but more probably he saw that, as it stood, it would not meet the standards of modern scholarship – not because of any faults or inaccuracies, but because of the questions which it failed to ask.[83]

[78] *BZ* 29 (1929/30), 297–304.

[79] 'A Sixth Century Botaniates', *Byz* 6 (1931), 405–10, and the article cited at n.65.

[80] *Archeologia* 83 (1933), 327–50; cf. also W.H. Buckler, 'The Frescoes at Galata, Cyprus', *JHSt* 53 (1933), 105–10.

[81] 'But then I resolved to get myself a hall-mark as a biblical critic of the Scripture lessons in our Girls' Public Day School Trust Schools by reading for the Archbishop's Diploma in Theology. However it has turned into apples of Sodom, for though I loved reviving my 20-year-old Hebrew for my special subject, I disliked the "Christian Doctrine" so cruelly, and found it so utterly futile, that (as it is obligatory) I dropped the whole scheme' (Notebook, dated May 1930).

[82] 'The Authorship of the Strategicon of Cecaumenos', *BZ* 36 (1936), 7–26; 'Can Cecaumenos be the Author of the Strategikon?' *Byz* 13, (1938) 139–41; 'Writings Familiar to Cecaumenos', *Byz* 15 (1940–1), 133–43.

[83] A suspicion of my own, confirmed by Sir Steven Runciman.

She was not so much handicapped by being a woman, as by age; yet one was in a sense the consequence of the other. When Georgina Walrond left Girton, there were two routes open to her. There was a fairly narrow range of careers which she might have followed – presumably in teaching or scholarly activity of some sort – or marriage. She got married; and there followed sixteen years dominated by what she referred to as her ill health – miscarriages, and the birth of premature babies who died at birth. And there was another complicating factor. It is clear from her private diary that in her private opinion, all academic studies were in fact a second-best; what she longed for was opportunities for 'altruism', for 'Good Works'. 'To me, Usefulness means helping someone'.[84] She wrote to her husband: 'For me to use my brains, a good deal of money, and all my nervous energy on a twelfth-century Greek author is just as wicked as it would be to spend it on playing bridge, when there are miners' families starving'. She took up her academic studies, eventually, largely to support and complement her husband's activities as a scholar; but she pined for a form of practical activity which she would have had difficulty in pursuing in any case in her generation, but which was particularly difficult for a married woman, and one living largely out of her own country. Again, this attitude surely reflects precisely her strenuously Christian upbringing; one is reminded of her father's departure from Oxford to join the new Civil Service Commission. He, in his generation, and Gilbert Murray and William Buckler in theirs, were able to move between the practical and the scholarly life; Georgina, as a woman, was never able to apply her full energies to the practical life, and would remain constantly unsatisfied, wondering what she might have done, how she could have fulfilled her headmistress's prophecy that she was to be 'one of the leading women of the future'. This very uncertainty as to what her true calling was must have been one of the influences that delayed her decision to commit herself to academic activities, where she probably had the best hope of fulfilment; it is quite characteristic of that long period – perhaps not yet quite closed – during which women's education trained many women to use powers which they were not then permitted to exercise.

In that way, therefore, Georgina Buckler is representative of the educated women of her generation. But her preoccupations also reflect other intellectual currents of the times. She was brought up in the Arnoldian tradition of the well-rounded person – the idea that the well-educated should excel in a broad range of activities. The tone of such an upbringing has been most lucidly brought out by David Newsome, in his study of Victorian education.[85] The classical education was broadening in many ways. Travel to the ancient lands was becoming increasingly possible, and one result was a confrontation with the post-classical civilizations of those lands – as exemplified by Sir William Ramsay. His letter of congratulation to Georgina on *Anna Comnena* is wonderfully

[84] Notebook, May 1930.

[85] D. Newsome, *Godliness and Good Learning* (London, 1961), Chapter 1.

characteristic, being full of questions about the topographical origins of Byzantine surnames.[86] At the same time, Gilbert Murray, the passionate Hellenist, presents an example of the multi-faceted life – scholarship as compatible with practical activity. His letter of congratulations is equally characteristic:

> What a mass of learning the book contains, and how full it is of interesting details both psychological and historical ! I knew you were engaged in some great work, but I did not realize that it was as important as this.

Then, in the following paragraph, he goes on to discuss the recent election.[87]

Already in Georgina's generation the route of classical studies had divided along many paths; and this is perhaps one way of understanding how she, and other, younger scholars, who might in the past automatically have studied classical topics, came to apply themselves to a later period. But the other crucial influence is that of Christianity. The first Greek text which Georgina read was the New Testament; old Mrs Buckler had taught herself Greek in order to read the Bible with young William. I have tried to set out above how interest in Orthodox Christianity, and in the civilization from which it sprang, had been increasing. It seems clear that to Georgina one of the most interesting aspects of Byzantine civilization was that it was a Christian civilization, and I think that we can regret that she did not continue with her idea of studying how the Byzantines used the Bible. This was an interest not, as nowadays, in Byzantine spirituality, but in Byzantium as a functioning Christian state, and in the Christian practice of 'ordinary' secular individuals, which could be tested – as in the case of Anna – against an accepted standard of virtues. This seems deeply alien to us, such a short time later; but, whatever the shortcomings of the approach, it led Georgina Buckler to take a Byzantine author seriously. That may not sound much, but, on reflection, it is quite an achievement.

---

[86] Letter of 1 June 1929: 'To make the ancient map of Asia Minor has always been my aim; epigraphy is a mere *parergon* to topography'.

[87] Letter of 10 June 1929.